

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

The attached three sheets of drawings include Figs. 1-3, which apparently have not yet been entered into the application.

Attachments: Three new Sheets

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 12-25 are now in the application. Claims 12-25 are subject to examination. Claim 21 has been amended. Claims 24 and 25 have been added.

Under the heading "Drawings" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner required a drawing.

The Examiner stated that the drawings from the PCT application are not currently on file. The exact drawings from PCT/EP2004/051634 have been provided. No new matter has been added.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12-23 have been rejected as being obvious over Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0112870 A1 to Kobayashi et al. in view of European Patent application EP 0 854 666 A2 to Lochbrunner et al. and further in view of Published U.S. Patent Application 2001/0017766 to Murowaki et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 12 includes the following limitations: The housing has a housing floor and a housing cover is connected to the housing floor. The housing floor, when

viewed in cross-section, has at least one indentation and housing internal lateral sections.

The Examiner has alleged that Kobayashi et al. teach a housing floor that has an indentation. Kobayashi et al. however, do not teach a housing floor having an indentation, but rather teach a flat housing floor as can be seen in Fig. 1, for example. Therefore, even if the teaching in Kobayashi et al. were modified in the manner put forth by the Examiner in view of the other cited teachings, the invention as defined by claim 12 would not have been suggested.

Applicants additionally point out that the cover 8 taught by Kobayashi et al. cannot be equated with the claimed housing floor because the cover would not satisfy other claimed limitations. Claim 12 specifies that the edge region of the printed circuit board is connected to the housing internal lateral sections of the housing floor via a heat-conducting adhesive layer. The cover 8 of Kobayashi et al. does not have lateral sections that are connected to the printed circuit board 2.

Claim 21 includes a step of providing a contoured housing floor having raised housing internal sections disposed in correspondence with the at least one second printed circuit board section.

As previously discussed, Kobayashi et al. teach a flat housing floor. Kobayashi et al. do not teach a contoured housing floor.

Claim 21 has been amended to even further distinguish the invention from the prior art by specifying that the annularly continuous groove is formed in the edge of the housing floor. Support for the change can be found by referring to Fig. 1 and to Fig. 3, which shows groove 38 formed in the housing floor 14.

In contrast to an annularly continuous groove formed in the edge of the housing floor, Kobayashi et al. teach a groove portion 59 that is formed in the top of the sidewall portions 53 and 54 (See Fig. 3).

Therefore, even if the teaching in Kobayashi et al. were modified in the manner put forth by the Examiner in view of the other cited teachings, the invention as defined by claim 21 would not have been suggested.

Claims 24 and 25 have been added to even further distinguish the invention from the prior art. Support for the changes can be found by referring to the application at page 3, lines 14-21, page 4, lines 15-18, and page 9, lines 11-15 and to Fig. 1, which clearly conveys the dual purpose. Additionally, Fig. 1 clearly shows that the raised (claim 24) or lateral (claim 25) housing internal sections serve as the main support for the printed circuit board in addition to dissipating heat via the heat-conducting adhesive.

Claim 25 specifies that said housing internal lateral sections dissipate heat away from said printed circuit board and serve as a main support for said printed circuit board. Similarly, claim 24 specifies performing steps c) and d) to enable the raised housing internal sections to dissipate heat away from the printed circuit board and to serve as a main support for the printed circuit board.

The Examiner stated that Murowaki et al. teach that a heat conducting adhesive is used to mount the circuit board to the housing of the electronic device in order to enhance the conduction of heat. The heat conductive adhesive of Murowaki et al. is used to adhere the circuit board 410 to the heat dissipating wall 408 so that heat generated by the driving elements 420 can be dissipated through the heat dissipating wall 408 (paragraph 0062). While there is a connection between the circuit board 410 to the heat dissipating wall 408, the main function performed is that of heat dissipation. The heat dissipating wall 408 does not serve as a main support for the circuit board 410. Rather, Murowaki et al. teach fixing the circuit board 410 to the supporting surfaces 409a, 415a of the stays 409 and 415. Screws and screw holes 414, 416, which are formed in the stays, are used to secure the circuit board 410 to the stays 409, 415 (see paragraph 0060 and Fig. 6a). Thus, it is clear that the stays 409, 415 serve as the main support for the circuit board 410.

Murowaki et al. do not teach housing internal sections that dissipate heat away from the printed circuit board and that serve as the main support for the printed

circuit board. The other cited prior art documents also do not teach such features. Therefore, the cited prior art could not suggest the invention as defined by claims 24 and 25.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 12 or 21. Claims 12 and 21 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 12 or 21.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 12-25 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/566,698
Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2008
Amdt. Dated October 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Werner H. Stemer/
Werner H. Stemer
(Reg. No. 34,956)

MPW:cgm

October 2, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101